CHAPTER – IV

JĪVA

JĪVA IN THE VEDIC LITERATURE

The term jīva is used, in the Upaniṣads to denote the ‘individual self’. Again the term ‘atman’ is used to denote both the Absolute (Brahman) and the ‘jīva’. In this context, it is said that the essence or real self of the individual is non-different from the essence of Brahman.

In the Rgveda1 atman means breath or the vital essence. Gradually it acquired the meaning of feeling, mind, soul and spirit. According to Śaṅkarācārya, the word atman means ‘that which pervades all, which is the subject and which knows, experiences and illuminates the objects and which remains immortal and always the same.’2

In its real nature the jīva is pure consciousness and pure bliss. It is divine in origin. It is eternal, unchangeable and imperishable. It is devoid of any body and is free from birth and death.3 It is free from sin, old age, death, grief, hunger and thirst.4 It is all-pervasive. Sometimes the jīva is described as having the measure of a thumb and sometimes as having an
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Ch.Up., 8.1.5.
atomic measure. Again, it is described as smaller than the small like atom etc and bigger than the big like sky.\(^5\) From these descriptions it is clear that the \(jīva\) cannot be measured in any way and that it transcends all the limitations of space. It is indefinable. Like all ultimate principle it has only to be accepted. The \(jīva\) cannot be known by the senses and the mind, nor can it be expressed by any words.\(^6\) Being of the nature of pure consciousness, the \(jīva\) is self-revealed, self-proved and never enveloped by ignorance. It is ever-free and is one with Absolute. Being of the nature of pure bliss, the \(jīva\) is never subjected to joys and sorrows of the world. The consciousness and bliss of the \(jīva\) have no reference to any object. Bondage of the \(jīva\) is not real. Purity is the original nature of \(jīva\). But in the empirical level this real nature of the \(jīva\) is not revealed. In this level it appears as possessing limited existence, limited consciousness and limited bliss. It is limited by time, space and matter or mind-body complex.

The individual self or \(jīva\) means the infinite self conditioned by the body, the senses and the mind.\(^7\) The senses, the mind, the intellect, feeling and will, the internal organ are all products of avidyā and they surround the individual self and constitute its ‘individuality’. But, in reality the \(jīva\) is above them, being the Absolute. The \(jīva\) is different from the body, the sense-organs, the mind (manas) and the intellect (buddhi). In Kathopaniṣad, the \(jīva\) is said to be the ultimate reality. The body is the chariot, the sense-organs are the horses, the mind is the reins, the intellect is the charioteer,

\(^6\) anorāṇiyānmahato mahīyanaḥ. ibid., 1.2.20
\(^7\) atmendriyamanyuktāṁ bhoktetyahurmanīśiṇaḥ. ibid., 1.3.4
the objects are the roads, while the jīva lying beyond the intellect is the
guide of the whole system. The Kathopaniṣad further states that the
senses are superior than the objects, the mind is superior to the senses, the
intellect is superior to the mind, the subtle reason (mahat) is superior to
the intellect, the unmanifest (avyakta) is superior to the subtle reason, and
the Puruṣa (ātman) is superior to the avyakta and there is nothing superior
to the Puruṣa, which is the Ultimate Reality. Objects, senses, mind, intellect,
reason—all exist for the self and serve its purpose. In other words these are
the instruments of the jīva by which it knows, acts and enjoys. Thus the
jīva is the jñāta (knower), montā (thinker), kartā (doer) and bhoktā
(enjoyer). It enjoys worldly experiences according to its actions. In short,
jīva is the subject of all experiences. The jīva is the constant and
unchangeable essence of a being; it is the common factor of a being in all
the states of walking, dream, sleep, death, rebirth and liberation. The jīva
is self-revealed and self-luminous. In the Brhadāranyaka-koṭiṣad,
Yājñavalkya states that, ‘when the sun has set, when the moon has set and
when the fire is put out, the self alone is his light.’ It means that even
when all objects are extinguished, the subject or the self persists in its own
light. The jīva does not perish with the destruction of its body. It
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transmigrates from one body to another. It takes birth one after another and continues through all these births. Actually the jīva is associated with an appropriate body in accordance with its merits and demerits. The Śruti\textsuperscript{13} says, ‘just as corns wither away and germinate again so mortal beings die and are reborn according to their mortal deserts.’

In the Taittirīya Upaniṣad it is said that the jīva is encased in five sheaths (koṣa). The body and the sense-organs constitute its bodily sheaths (annamayakoṣa), which is sustained by food. Within the bodily sheath there is the vital sheath (prāṇamaya koṣa). The vital forces (prāṇa), which animate the body, are its parts. The vital sheath consists of the vital forces. Within the vital sheath there is the mental sheath (manomayakoṣa), which depends on the manas. Within the mental sheath there is the intellectual sheath (vijñānamayakoṣa), which has the intellect as the fundamental principle. Within the intellectual sheath there lies the blissful sheath (ānandamayakoṣa). Subject-objectless consciousness and bliss constitute the blissful sheath. Ānanda is absolute freedom. It is infinite and non-empirical. Actually ānanda does not constitute a sheath of the self; it constitutes the very essence of the jīva.

In the Chāndogya Upaniṣad \textsuperscript{14} a progressive development of the jīva is found through the four stages of – 1) the bodily self, 2) the empirical self, 3) the transcendental self, and 4) the absolute self. In a dialogue between Prajāpati and Indra narrated in this Upaniṣad, we find a development of the concept of the self from the waking or the bodily self through the dreaming or the empirical self and the self in deep dreamless

\textsuperscript{13} sasyam iva martyah pacyate sasyam iva jāyate punah. Ka.Up., 1.1.6.
\textsuperscript{14} Ch. Up. 8.3 – 12.
sleep to the absolute self. This dialogue brings out the essential nature of the self. The four stages of the self is termed as jāgrata (waking state), svapna (dream state), suṣupti (dreamless state) and turīya (fourth state) respectively. The jāgrata or waking state is that in which the self knows and enjoys external objects through external sense-organs. In this state the self is called viśva or vaiśvānara. The state of svapna or dream state is called taijasa, which knows and enjoys the subtle internal objects through the internal organ or mind. The self in the state of suṣupti or dreamless sleep is that which exists simply as consciousness and bliss without apprehending or enjoying any external or internal objects. In this state the self attains its real nature, but is not freed from ignorance. In this state the self is called prajñā. In the fourth state the self exists as pure transcendental consciousness and bliss freed from ignorance. In this state the self shines in its own light as the ultimate subject without reducing itself to a mere abstraction. It is the foundation of all existence and the presupposition of all knowledge. This state of the self is called ‘turīya’ or ‘amārta’ the measureless. In reality this self is the common ground of all these three states. It manifests itself in these three states and yet in its own nature it transcends them all. The self in this state is called ātman.  

There are some passages in the Upaniṣads, which clearly show the identity of the jīva with Brahman. The Upaniṣads say, ‘that thou art’, ‘the

16. tat tvam asi. Ch.Up., 2.5.9.
self is Brahman'17 ‘One who knows Brahman becomes Brahman’,18 ‘All is Brahman’19 and so on. According to the Upanisadic view, the differences are created by ignorance; when ignorance is destroyed by true knowledge one feels identity with Brahman and also with everything.

There are some Upanisadic texts, which clearly describe both the difference and non-difference between the individual self and the universal self. According to these Upanisadic passages the self is a part of Brahman. The most remarkable passage of this type runs thus: ‘the selves emerge from Brahman like sparks from a blazing fire’.20 The description of the two birds in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad also describe the same view. Here the first bird represents the individual self while the second represents Brahman, the universal self. Through this simile of the two birds a difference between the individual self and Brahman is admitted, though absolute equality is said to arise at the end. This passage may also be regarded as an example of the relation of difference cum non-difference between the self and Brahman.

Again, there are some passages in the Upaniṣads, which show the individual self and the supreme self as different from each other.21 From

17. ayam ātmā brahma. Brh.Up., 2.5.9.
18. brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati. Mu.Up. 2.2.9.
(ii) sarvājīve sarvasaristhe vṛhante asmin haṁso bhṛmyate brahmacakre prthagātmānaṁ prerītāraṁ ca matvā juṣṭaṁtastatenāṁṛtatvameti // Sv.Up.,1.6.
these passages, it can be said that the individual self is the doer of actions and enjoyer of happiness and misery, while Brahman or the Supreme Self is the action-less witness free from happiness and misery. The individual self is endowed with limited power and knowledge. Accordingly the self and Brahman are to be regarded as different from each other.

The concept of individual self (jīva) is common to all the orthodox Indian philosophical systems. But, it is a fact that different systems differ widely in their discussion of the nature of the jīva.

JĪVA ACCORDING TO SĀṂKHYA–YOGA:

According to Sāṃkhya philosophy the puruṣa or self with ahamkāra is the jīva, and not puruṣa itself. In Sāṃkhya, puruṣa is called self. The puruṣa is an eternal, ubiquitous, immaterial, inactive, immobile, eternally pure, conscious and free spirit. The self as determined by the body and sense-organs is the jīva. When the self is determined by the body and the sense-organs, it can act and enjoy. Aniruddha in his Sāṃkhyaśātrasūtra defines jīva as the self determined by the body, the external sense-organs, manas, ahamkāra and buddhi. The self becomes the jīva, when it is determined by the body and connected with manas through its relation to life which contains an aggregate of air, light and the like.Merit, demerit, knowledge, ignorance, pleasure, pain and the like are modes of buddhi or ahamkāra in conjunction with the external senses, which are in communion
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22. taccāhaṃkārabhiṣṭapuruṣasyādhamo na tu kevalapuruṣasya. SPB, 6.63.
24. viśiṣṭasya jīvaḥ vamnvayavyatirekāḥ SS, 6.63.
25. SSV, 1.97.
with their objects. In reality, *buddhi* is transparent owing to the excess of *sattva* in it. When the self is reflected in *buddhi*, it wrongly thinks itself to be active. This false appropriation of the activity belongs to the *jīvātman*, not to the self.

Vijñānabhikṣu defines the *jīva* as the self limited by *ahāṁkāra*. He says that the *jīva* differs from the *puruṣa* or the self in that the former is limited by the adjunct of the internal organ, while the latter is the pure self free from all determinations.²⁶ He further defines the *jīva* as the self reflected in the internal organ or *buddhi*, which is active, as distinguished from the *puruṣa* or the pure self which is immutable and of nature of transcendental consciousness, and, therefore, inactive.²⁷ He further says that the self as limited and determined by its psycho-physical organism, the body, the senses, the *manas*, *buddhi* and *ahāṁkāra* is the *jīva*. All empirical cognitions, feelings, emotions, volitions, actions, merits and demerits belong to the *jīva*. When the limiting adjunct of the psycho-physical organism is completely destroyed, the *jīva* becomes identical with the *puruṣa* and realizes its intrinsic freedom. It is manifested as pure, transcendental consciousness entirely free from all entanglements in *prakṛti*.²⁸ So, it can be said that the *jīva* is the mixture of free spirit and mechanism of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*.

According to Sāṅkhya, the body, *manas, buddhi, ahāṁkāra* and all their modes are the modes of *prakṛti*. All these are unconscious objects

---

26. SPB, 6.63. op.cit. fn. 22
27. jīvānāṁantaḥkaraṇā-pratibimbitanāṁ sannidhānādevādhiṣṭhāṭrtaṁ. ibid., 1.97.
28. SSV, 6.59.
and they constitute the jīva. Puruṣa is the subject self and jīva is the object self. Again puruṣa is the seer (draṣṭṛ) and jīva is the seen (dṛṣṭya). In Sāṁkhyasūtravṛtti, it is found that every jīva has a subtle body (liṅgaśarīra) endowed with ten sense-organs, manas, buddhi and ahaṁkāra and five subtle essence. It is the basis of rebirth. The subtle body is the medium of enjoyment (bhoga) and that enjoyment is real. The jīva enjoys its empirical life through it. Every jīva differs from one another on account of their different moral deserts.

According to the Sāṁkhya the bondage of the jīva is due to the subtle body through which merit (dharma) and demerit (adharma), which are the modes of ahaṁkāra, are wrongly appropriated by the self or puruṣa. The bondage is only phenomenal. So long as the subtle body continues, merit and demerit are wrongly owned by the puruṣa. When the jīva gains the discriminative knowledge of distinction between prakṛti and puruṣa, merit and demerit are destroyed, and, therefore, no longer associated with it. When the merit and demerit are destroyed, jīva attains liberation. According to Sāṁkhyaapravacanasūtra, discrimination (viveka) leads to the destruction of merit and demerit, which dissolves the subtle body, annihilates empirical life and leads to liberation.

Regarding the concept of jīva it may be mentioned that Patañjali systematized the conceptions of the Yoga and set them forth on the background of the metaphysics of the Sāṁkhya, with slight variations. In

29. SSV, 3.9.
30. vyatibhedah karmaviśeṣat SS, 3.10.
31. karmaninimta prakṛteḥ sva-svāṃibhāvo apyonādirbijāṁkuravat ibid, 6. 67.
the early works, the Yoga principles appear along with the Sāṁkhya ideas. The twenty-five principles of the Sāṁkhya are accepted by the Yoga which does not care to argue about them. The universe is uncreated and eternal. It undergoes changes. In its noumenal state it is called *prakṛti* which is associated with the *guṇas* and is always the same. There are countless individual selves which animate living beings and are by nature pure, eternal and immutable. But through the association with the universe, they become indirectly the experiencers of joys and sorrows, and assume innumerable embodied forms in the course of *samsāra*. Regarding the development of *prakṛti*, the Yoga holds that there are two parallel lines of evolution, starting from *mahat*, which on the one side develops into *ahamkāra, manas*, the five senses of cognition and the five senses of action and on the other, develops into the five gross elements through the five *tanmātras*.

Ignorance of the true nature of things causes desires and the like, which are the basis of pain and suffering in the world. The question of the origin of ignorance is meaningless in view of the beginninglessness of the world. Even in *pralaya* the individual *cittas* of *puruṣas* return to *prakṛti* and lie within it, together with their own *avidyās* and at the time of each new creation on evolution of the world these are created anew, with such changes as are due to the individual *avidyās*. These latter manifest themselves in the *cittas* as the *kleśas* or afflictions which again lead to *karmāśaya, jāti, āyus* and *bhoga*. The Yoga accounts for creation by the two agencies of God and *avidyā*. *Avidyā* is unintelligent and so is not conscious of the desires of the innumerable *puruṣas*. The *jīva* is found to be involved in matter and this constitutes his fall from his purity and
innocence. The individual in the Yoga is not so much at the mercy of prakṛti as in the Sāṃkhya. He has greater freedom and with the help of God he can effect his deliverance. As in the Sāṃkhya so in the Yoga the round of rebirths with its many pains is that which is to be escaped from, the conjunction of pradhāna and self is the cause of this saṁsāra, the destruction of this conjunction is the escape and perfect insight is the means of escape.32 The self is the seer and pradhāna is the object of knowledge and their conjunction is the cause of saṁsāra. The aim of the Yoga is to free the individual from the clutches of matter. The highest form of matter is citta and the Yoga lays down the course by which a man can free himself from the fetters of citta.

**JĪVA ACCORDING TO NYĀYA:**

The Nyāya system of philosophy adopts the realistic view of the individual self or jīva. The Naiyāyikas use the term ‘ātman’ to denote both the self and God. According to them ātman means the ‘locus of knowledge’. Of these two, the self is called the jīvatman. According to Nyāya, the jīva is a real substantive being, having for its qualities desire, aversion, volition, pleasure, pain and cognition. These are not physical qualities perceived by the external senses. In reality, they are the peculiar properties of some substances other than and different from all physical substances. The jīva is unique in each individual.33 There are different individual selves in
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32. saṁsāraḥ saṁsāraḥetumokṣo mokṣopāya iti tatra duḥkhabahulaḥ saṁsāro heyah pradhāna puruṣayoh saṁyogo heyahetuḥ. YB, II, 15.
33. tasmād avastudārāsanabalaprvṛttiṁ āgamāśrayamanumānaṁ āśritya tadarthavicāreṣu viruddhāvyabhicāriṁ sādhanadoṣa uktaḥ. NB, 3.114.
different bodies, i.e. there are infinite numbers of selves and their experiences do not overlap but are kept distinct. If one jīva is present in all bodies, then experiences of pleasure or pain of a particular jīva will be the same experience of all the jīvas, which is not the case. The jīva is indestructible and an eternal entity which is from time to time connected with a body.

The jīva is partless (nimvayava) and eternal. It has no beginning and no end. If a self once began to be, it will sometimes cease to be. Again the self cannot be a limited size, because what is limited has parts and, therefore, is destructible. A self must be either atomic or infinite and of no medium size. Further, if the self is of the same size as the body, it will be too small for the body, as it grows from birth onwards. Nor can the difficulty of its changing dimension from birth to birth be avoided. Therefore, the self is all-pervading. In this context Udayana says that the self is not bigger than an atom in size though capable of pervading the body. The self is, therefore, all-pervading or infinite. But though the self is all-pervading, its actions and feelings are perceived in a particular body, since the actions and feelings of the self can be manifested only through a psycho-physical organism.

According to Naiyāyika the self is distinct from the body, senses, manas and the stream of consciousness. In this context the Naiyāyika says that when the body is lost, the senses are cut off and manas is quieted down, but the self is still present. Further they say that body, senses, manas all these belong to the object side and can never be the subject while self is the subject. Again intellect or buddhi cannot take the place of the self. The
intellect is not a subject nor the cogniser, but a quality of the self which is capable of being perceived. In reality intelligence cannot subsist without certain locus. Therefore, the self is not intelligence as such, but a substance having intelligence as its attribute. The self is the perceiver of all that brings about pain and pleasure (sarvasya draṣṭā), the enjoyer of all pains and pleasure (bhoktā) and the knower of all things (sarvānubhavit).

According to the Naiyāyikas the selves are distinct not only from one another but also from God or Paramātman. Both the self and God are endowed with different qualities. The self is subject to joys and sorrows, while God is endowed with eternal bliss. The knowledge, action and will of the jīva are non-eternal and limited, while those of God are eternal and unlimited. In all the circumstances, God controls the jīvas and associates them with the fruits according to their own actions. Finally, God leads them to the state of liberation. But, it is noteworthy that according to the Naiyāyikas, the selves are not identical with God under any circumstances. In liberation also, the jīva remains as a distinct identity. The Nyāya system admits that in the state of liberation the jīva is devoid of bliss or pleasure, for pleasure is always tainted with pain. In this context Uddyotokāra urges that if the released jīva is to have eternal pleasure, it must also have an eternal body, since experience is not possible without an organism.34 Bhasarvajña and his followers and Gautama accept the existence of bliss in liberation.

34. tadatyantavimokṣopavargaḥ. Vārtika 1.1.22.
The Vaiśeṣika school of philosophy is a realistic and pluralistic school of philosophy. This system has divided all the substances into nine kinds. Of them ātman has been divided into two types, namely, jīvātman or the individual self and the Parmātman or the supreme self. The jīvātman is infinite in number and is different in every individual self as well as every category. According to Vaiśeṣika philosophy, the term 'ātman' means 'the locus of knowledge'. Again it means that which is the substance of will or volition. In its real nature the self is partless and eternal. It is unchangeable and imperishable. At any circumstances it is not subject to origination and destruction. The jīva is a real substantive being, having for its qualities knowledge, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, volition, merit, demerit and disposition. Again number, magnitude distinctness, conjunction and disjunction are its generic qualities. In its natural state the jīva is devoid of intelligence, as in pralaya.

According to Vaiśeṣika the jīva has no beginning and no end, for if a jīva once began to be, it will sometime cease to be. Further, the Vaiśeṣika says that a self must be either atomic or infinite and of no medium size. Again, if the jīva is of the same size as the body, it will be too small for the body, as it grows from the birth onwards. Therefore, the self is all-pervading. But, though the jīva is all-pervading, its life of knowing, feeling and activity resides only where the body is.

According to Vaiśeṣika the jīva is too subtle to be perceived. It cannot be perceived through the external sense-organs. They try to prove the existence of jīva by means of inference. First the self is inferred from the
perception of sound and the other sensible qualities as its substratum. Secondly, the activity of sense-organs requires an agent (karṣṭā) who uses them in order to know objects. The sense-organs are the instruments of experience. They require the finite self (atom) 35 Thirdly, the Vaiśeṣikas say that pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, volition etc are the qualities of the self, not of the body or the sense-organs. Fourthly, recollection and recognition prove the existence of the self. According to Vaiśeṣika, the self is the substratum of all the qualities like recollection etc. The self remembers an object, which it perceived in the past and retained it in the form of impression. Recollection proves the unity and identity of the self and recognition proves the permanence of it. Fifthly, the vital acts of inspiration and expiration, the opening and the closing of the eye, the growth of the body, self-re recuperation of wounds, the movements of the manas and the impulsion of the sense-organs prove the existence of the self.36 These vital acts are not due to vital forces only, but to the voluntary direction of the self. Lastly, apperception proves the existence of the self. Thus, the Vaiśeṣikas give these arguments to prove the existence of the self or ātman. The Vaiśeṣikas recognize the plurality of selves which is inferred from the variety of experiences and conditions of different selves.

Though it is already stated that the self is partless, in its empirical level, the self is endowed with a body, sense-organs, vital airs, mind and so on. But, the self is entirely different from all these elements. By the

35. vāṣyādīnāṁ iva karaṇāṇāṁ karṣṭprayojaṁ tvadārṣaṁātanāṁ
praśādhako'numiyate. PBh, p. 69.
36. prāṇapāṇanimesonmesajivaṁvanamanogatindriyantaravikāraḥ
suṣkhaduḥkhecchādevaṣaprayatnāścātmano liṅgāni. VS, 3.2.4.
influence of ignorance and the merits and demerits acquiring from past actions, the self is endowed with ahāmkarā and undergoes bondage. Then the self is attached to the objects of enjoyment and acts for the attainment of pleasure and avoidance of pain. Thus the self becomes a real knower, doer and enjoyer in empirical state. In this state the self is thus endowed with the qualities of desire, aversion, volition, pleasure, pain etc. In the state of liberation, the self is not affected by ignorance and the merits and demerits. It realizes its real nature and freed from the fetters of body, sense-organs etc. The self is unaffected by the qualities of desire, aversion etc. Vaiśeṣika is of opinion that in liberation the self is devoid of bliss or pleasure, because the pleasure is always mixed with pains.

**Jīva according to Mīmāṃsā:**

According to the Mīmāṃsakas the self and matter are said to be self-existent and self-guided. The selves are guided by the effects of their own karmas (adṛṣṭa). The Mīmāṃsakas prescribe the self as a real substance endowed with the attribute of knowledge, action and feeling. The self performs actions and experiences their results either in this world or the other world. According to Kumārila the self is self-illuminated or apprehended by itself. The self is a knower (jñāta), enjoyer (bhoktā) and active agent (kartā). It is a substance of cognition, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, volition, impression, merit and demerit, which are its mode.

According to the Mīmāṃsakas, the self is eternal; it is devoid of origination and destruction. It is all-pervading and it is not limited by time and space. It is neither atomic nor intermediary in magnitude. Though the self is described as all-pervading, but its qualities like pleasure, pain etc
are manifested only in a particular body and are experienced by the particular individual concerned. According to Mīmāṃsakas the events happening in the body of an individual cannot be experienced by another, because the experience of an individual depends upon the actions connected with the body of that individual. The Mīmāṃsakas accept a separate category named śakti or energy. The all-pervading self is endowed with this energy which it imparts to the body and causes it to move. Thus, the self is admitted as an agent not because it moves but because it causes the body to move.

The self is a permanent entity. As a permanent entity it is distinct from the body, sense-organs and intellect. The self is different from the body, because it is endowed with the qualities of knowledge, feeling etc, but the body is devoid of them. Further, the self is imperceptible to others, while the latter is perceptible to them. The self is the knower (aham) and the latter is a known object (idam). The self is also different from sense-organs. The self is a conscious agent of the sense-organs. The sense-organs cannot function without the guidance of the self. Even on the destruction of a sense-organ the self persists or it can remember objects perceived in the past through it. The self is different from intellect (buddhi) also. Because during sleep buddhi is absent, but the self persists as is clear from recollection like, “I sleep happily”. Thus the self endures through all the changes of body, the senses and the intellect.

37. dharmādharmābhyaṁ yāti śarīrendriyāni upāttāni, tāni tasyaiva bhogasādhanāni. Prpn, p. 344.
38. buddhāndriya-śarirebhyo bhinnā ātmā vibhur dhruvah. ibid., p.316.
Prabhākara Mimāṃsakas admit the existence of a permanent self and it can be known indirectly from the fact of recognition. Prabhākara argues that one can remember a past cognition points to the existence of a permanent self as the substrate of earlier perception and present recollection. Thus, Prabhākara admits that the permanent self is not the object of recognition, but the substrate thereof. He says that the self cannot be an object of perception, external or internal. The self is not perceptible in itself, but is always known as the agent (kartā) of the cognition but not the object (karma). The self cannot be both the subject and the object of knowledge. But Kumārila Bhaṭṭa of the Bhaṭṭa School of Pūrvamīmāṃśa accepts the self as both the subject and the object of consciousness. They say that if the self is not an object of knowledge, the Upanisadic injunction ‘know the self’ will be meaningless. Again in the phenomena of recognition and recollection of the object appears in consciousness and not the subject. Hence, the recollection of the self shows without any doubt that the self can become an object of perception. In the view of Kumārila the self is both the subject and object of knowledge, and this is no contradiction since we distinguish the self as the dravya or the substantial element which is the object of knowledge and an element of consciousness (bodha) which is the subject of cognition.39

According to Mimāṃsakas, the self is not one but many. It is different in every individual. If there were no different selves, there would not be differences in experiences of pleasure, pain etc in different individuals. The difference of dharma and adharma, which are the qualities of the self,

require the existence of different selves. If there were only one self in all persons, then all of them would be endowed with the same attributes. As regards the Upanisadic statement that "the self is one", Kumārila opines that the implication of this statement lies not in the oneness of the selves, but in their similarity, because all the selves being of the nature of consciousness, are similar to one another.\(^40\)

Both Prabhākara and Kumārila state that in the state of liberation the self is devoid of cognition. But this view depends upon their views of accepting the nature of consciousness of the self or not. Prabhākara and Pārthasārathi hold that the self in liberation is devoid of bliss. On the other hand, according to Kumārila liberation is a state of bliss.

**Jīva in Vedānta Schools of Indian Philosophy**

**Jīva According to Śamkara:**

According to Advaita Vedantins the jīva is identical with Brahman and it is also the fundamental concept of Advaita. They maintain that the jīva is in essence existence, consciousness and bliss (saccidānandarūpa). Like Brahman the jīva is also eternal, pure, conscious, unchangeable, self-complete and ever-free. It is not limited by time, space etc. it does not undergo birth and death. It has neither origination nor destruction. Bondage of the jīva is not real. If it were real, its destruction and liberation would be impossible. It is one and it is the same self that exists in all beings. Due to ignorance, the jīva is regarded as many in different individuals.\(^{41}\)

---

41. bhedastu upādhinimitto mithyā-jñāna-kalpito na pāramārthikah. BSS, 1.4.10.
But in the empirical level this real nature of the \textit{jīva} is not revealed. In this level, \textit{jīva} appears as possessing limited existence, limited consciousness and limited bliss. Actually, in the empirical level, the universal self (\textit{atman}) conditioned either by \textit{avidyā} or by the \textit{antahkaraṇa} is revealed as \textit{jīva} or empirical self. The empirical self cannot be regarded as eternal, since it undergoes birth and death. It is also not pure, as it is subject to desire, hatred etc. The empirical \textit{jīva} is bound also, as it does not perceive its real nature and strive for freedom.

In the empirical level, the \textit{jīva} appears as the doer (\textit{karta}) and enjoyer (\textit{bhoktā}). It acquires merits and demerits according to its good and bad deeds and experiences their fruits. The \textit{jīva} is the embodied self. It is endowed with three different bodies, viz. \textit{sthūla-śarīra} or the gross body, \textit{sūkṣma-śarīra} or subtle body and \textit{karaṇa-śarīra} or causal body. The gross body is composed of the five gross elements, the sense-organs and the vital forces. The subtle body is made of five sense-organs, five motor-organs, five vital-airs, the mind and the intellect. The causal-body is made of false knowledge of the not-self as the self. The false-knowledge or \textit{avidyā} is the cause of both the gross and the subtle bodies. In the waking stage, \textit{jīva} is endowed with the gross and the subtle bodies and is called \textit{viśva}; in the dream stage it is endowed with the subtle body and is called \textit{taijasa}; and in the deep-sleep stage it is endowed with causal body and called \textit{prajñā}.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{42} ‘prajñānāghana evānandamaya’ ityādiśruteḥ suṣuptau prakāśāprakāśasadbhānmanam na jānāmityādyānubha vāccājñānopahitam caitanyamātmeti vadati. \textit{Vedānta-Sūra}, 43.
Regarding the question, whether the \textit{jīva} is one or many there are differences of opinion among the Advaitins. Sureśvarācārya, the propounder of \textit{drṣṭi-sṛṣṭi-vāda} admits that the \textit{jīva} is one, other \textit{jīvas} are illusory. This theory is called \textit{ekajījavāda} or the theory of single \textit{jīva}.\textsuperscript{43} Another group of \textit{ekajījavādins} hold that \textit{Hiranyagarbha}, who is a reflection of Brahman is the principal \textit{jīva}, while all other \textit{jīvas} are his mere reflections. Again another theory upholds that the single-\textit{jīva} is one who animates all the bodies without any distinction. But, it is noteworthy that most of the Advaitins opine that the \textit{jīva} is many, because the adjunct of the \textit{jīva}, namely, the internal organ or the individual nescience is different in different individuals. They also admit that the plurality of the \textit{jīvas} must be maintained in order to distinguish between the bound and the released \textit{jīvas}.\textsuperscript{44}

The later Vedāntins accept an intermediate stage called \textit{sākṣin} or witness-self in between the \textit{jīva} and the \textit{ātman} (universal self). They further uphold that this \textit{sākṣin} is different from both the \textit{jīva} and \textit{ātman}. Regarding the relation between the \textit{jīva} and the witness-self, there are various opinions among the Advaitins. Vidyāranya opines that the witness-self is of the nature of unchanging consciousness, which is the substratum of the phenomena of the gross body and the subtle body. The witness-self is inactive. It does not act, but remains witness to the acts of the \textit{jīva}. It illumines the body, \textit{manas}, \textit{buddhi}, egoism, etc and shines even when these elements cease to function, as in deep sleep. This witness-self accounts for the facts of personal identity, memory, recognition etc. Dharmarajādhvarindra distinguishes the

\textsuperscript{43} \begin{quote}
\text{ekasya eva jīvatvāt itareṣāṁ taddṛṣṭiṣvijṛmbhitatvena tataḥ anatirekāt.} \\
\textit{Vedānta-Sāra}, 36.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{44} \begin{quote}
\text{jīvabhedastāvat āvaṣyikaḥ baddhamuktapratibhāsāt.} \\
\textit{BSS}, 4.2.12.
\end{quote}
\( jīva \) and the \( sākṣīn \). According to him the \( sākṣīn \) is the eternal consciousness conditioned by the internal organ. The internal organ does not enter into the being of the eternal consciousness, simply qualifies it. But, on the other hand the \( jīva \) is the eternal consciousness determined by the internal organ, which enters into its being and qualifies it.\(^{45}\) The \( jīva \) being many, the witness-self forming the foundation of the \( jīva \) is also different in different \( jīvas \).\(^{46}\)

Śaṅkara does not make any difference between the \( ātman \) and \( sākṣīn \). He regards the universal self immanent in the \( jīva \), as the witness-self (\( sākṣīn \)) of all cognitions or mental modes cognitions are produced and destroyed. But their witness is eternal. Vācaspati Miśra also upholds the same view. He opines that the \( ātman \) conditioned by the mind-body-complex is called \( jīva \) and the pure \( ātman \) is \( sākṣīn \).

Regarding the relation between the Brahman and the \( jīva \), Śaṅkara opines that there is no ontological difference between the \( jīva \) and Brahman. Their differences is empirical due to limiting adjuncts of body, senses, \textit{manas} and \textit{buddhi} composed of empirical names and forms constructed by \textit{avidyā}. The purity of indeterminate Brahman is the real nature of \( jīva \). Actually, \( jīva \)'s enjoyments, sufferings and the like are its accidental nature due to its limiting adjuncts.\(^{47}\)

\(^{45}\) tatra jīvo nāmāntaḥkaraṇāvaccinna caitanyāṁ, tatsākṣī tu antaḥkaraṇopahitacaitanyāṁ. VP, p.70.

\(^{46}\) jīvasākṣī pratyātmāṁ nānā. ibid., p.73.

\(^{47}\) tat paraṁ brahma. tacca apahatapāpmaḥdīhyadharmaṁ, tadeva jīvasya pāramārthikāṁ svarūpaṁ, netarāt, upādhiḥkalpitaṁ.

BSS, 1.3.19.
Here a question arises as how can the infinite universal self or Brahman of the nature of untainted knowledge and bliss become the limited jīva. On this point Śaṅkara argues that Brahman does not become jīva, simply seems to be so. Avidyā is only responsible for the false representation of Brahman. For explaining this position Śaṅkara takes the help of two types of images. He discusses the jīva sometimes as a limitation of Brahman by the internal organ, like the limitation of space by a jar and sometimes as a reflection of Brahman in nescience like the reflection of the sun in water. Later these two theories are known as the theory of limitation (avacchedavāda) and the theory of reflection (pratibimbavāda).

According to avacchedavāda, Brahman limited by the individual nescience or its product antahkaraṇa is the jīva. When the adjunct of avidyā or its product is destroyed, the jīva becomes identical with Brahman.48 According to pratibimbavāda, the jīva is a reflection of Brahman in the internal organ or individual nescience. As there is no difference between bimba and the pratibimba, the jīva is non-different from Brahman.

According to both these theories, namely the theory of reflection and the theory of limitation, the empirical self can be regarded as a part of Brahman from the empirical point of view. From the transcendental point of view, Brahman is impartible and hence, the concept of part and whole is not at all applicable to it.

48. avidyopādhāna kalpitāvacchedo jīvaḥ. Bhāmati on BSS, 2.2.1.
The philosophy of Rāmānuja is known as Viśiṣṭādvaita. He admits three kinds of categories, namely, Brahmān, or Īśvara, cit or self and acit or matter. The cit elements or the selves and the acit elements or matter are related to Brahmān as bodies and as modes, which are technically called prākāras or ṣeṣas or viśeṣaṇas. These elements are different from the essential nature of Brahmān, but they are non-different from Brahmān, since they have no separate existence apart from it.

The jīva is different from the sense-organs, the body, the vital airs and the mind. It is of the nature of consciousness, and also the substratum of consciousness. Consciousness is both the substance and the attribute of the self like the light of a lamp. The self is thus both knowledge and the substrate of knowledge. The jīva is also the knower (jñātā) and the knowledge (jñāna).

The jīva being of the nature of consciousness is self-revealed. It reveals itself without the help of any other principle. Though the jīva is essentially conscious and self-revealed, it cannot realize its nature during bondage, because in that state the substratum of true knowledge is enveloped by the power of avidyā. In consequence, the jīva behaves like an unconscious material object. When the substratum of true knowledge is manifested by spiritual practice, the jīva realizes its essentially conscious and self-revealing nature. The jīva is of the nature of bliss also. In this context, Rāmānuja says that peace and bliss experienced during dreamless
sleep may be regarded as originating from the essence of the jīva itself, because no other source is there at that time.⁴⁹

According to Rāmānuja the jīva is eternal. It persists in all times. It is unborn and immortal. The jīva is seer (draṣṭr), doer (kartr) and enjoyer (bhoktr). But the power of agency and the power of enjoyment are not natural to the real self. They are generated in it only in its empirical level. When the jīva is associated with a psycho-physical organism, it performs actions relating to the worldly life, enjoys pleasures and pains accruing from them. In its real nature and in its transcendental nature, the jīva is neither an agent nor an enjoyer. According to Rāmānuja, the jīva is not identical with Brahman. He says that the jīva is finite, atomic and imperfect, while the Brahman is infinite, all-pervasive and perfect.

In the view of Rāmānuja the jīva is a part of Brahman. But it does not mean that the jīva is separated from the being of Brahman, because Brahman does not admit any division. It is admitted only in the sense that the jīva is a quality (viśeṣaṇa) of the Brahman. In reality the jīva and the Brahman are different in their essential nature, though they are inseparable or non-different from each other.⁵⁰ Rāmānuja says that the jīvas are the effects of Brahman and they cannot exist apart from Brahman.

According to Rāmānuja, the jīva and Brahman are different in essence, because the jīva is finite and imperfect, while Brahman is infinite and perfect. On the other hand, the jīva being inseparable from Brahman, there is identity between the two. Rāmānuja reconciles both these

⁴⁹. ānandasvarūpatvaṁ sukhasvarūpatvaṁ. Tattvatraya 5.
⁵⁰. prabhātadāśryayor api tādātmyāṁ. BSR, 3.2.27.
concepts of difference and identity by regarding the jīva as a part of Brahman. It is noteworthy that the philosophy of Rāmānuja is called Viśiṣṭādvaita, because the jīvas and matter are consumed within the Brahman.

JĪVA ACCORDING TO MADHVA:

In the view of Madhva the jīva is dependent on Brahman, which is identified with Śrīkṛṣṇa. Madhva’s philosophy is known as Dvaitavāda or dualism, because according to him the jīvas and the material world are quite different from Brahman. The jīvas are neither identical with Brahman nor they are related to it as part or attribute.

According to Madhva, the jīvas are finite centres of consciousness. The jīvas are many in number, since every individual is endowed with a distinct jīva. Further, the jīvas are also distinct from each other. In its real nature the jīva is endowed with pure consciousness and bliss, and is essentially free from ignorance and misery. The jīva is eternal. Madhva says that if the jīva may not exist till the ripening of the fruits of its own deeds, the law of karman and all other concepts of moral values will have to be abandoned and accordingly, the pursuit for liberation will be meaningless.

According to Madhva, the jīvas are many and are distinct from one another and it is proved by the fact that every individual has got his unique experiences. In his view, the jīvas are metaphysically dependent on Brahman for their very being and becoming. Brahman sustains the jīvas in all their five states of existence, namely, waking (jāgrata), dream (svapna), dreamless (suṣupti), swoon (murchā) and death (maraṇa). In all the state

51. mūrenā prabodhanaṁ caiva yata eva pravartate iti kaurme.
BSM, 3.2.10.
of actions and attainments, the jīvas are dependent upon the grace of the Lord. Even in the state of dissolution and release, the jīvas are dependent on Brahman. In the view of Madhva, Īśvara is the ultimate cause of the ignorance and bondage of the jīvas. Ignorance, which causes the fall of man and subjects him to earthly bondage is caused by the māyā, which is the power of Īśvara. Māyā envelops the innate nature of the jīva and binds it in the cycle of birth and death. By the grace of Īśvara, the jīvas acquire the true knowledge of reality. In the state of liberation also the jīvas are dependent upon Īśvara or Brahman. Madhva further holds that the liberated self attains a divine body and exists in Vaikunṭha in the eternal service to Śrīkṛṣṇa, the Lord. Madhva firmly holds the view that the jīva is different from Brahman. But, he further adds that, Brahman and the jīva are said to be identical only because they are similar in nature, and because the qualities of Brahman like knowledge, bliss etc are the essence of the jīva.52

JĪVA ACCORDING TO VALLABHA:

According to Vallabha the jīva is a part (aṁśa) of Brahman and it is real. Brahman transforms itself into the jīvas and matter. In this system both the jīvas and the material world are accepted as real. Though, Brahman transforms into the jīvas and matter, it remains eternally in its pure and immutable form and therefore this system is called pure non-dualism or Śuddhādvaita.

According to Vallabha, the jīva is birthless, deathless and eternal. In its empirical level the jīva is atomic in size and not all-pervasive. Though

52. jñānānandādi brahmagnāḥ eva asya sārasvarūpaṁ atah
       avedayapadesaḥ. BSM, 2.3.28
it is atomic, it pervades the body through its consciousness. But in its real nature jīva is all-pervasive. Actually, the minuteness of the jīva is due to the obscuration of its real nature, specially its bliss aspect. When this bliss aspect is fully manifested in the state of liberation, the jīva again acquires all-pervasiveness.\footnote{53. ānandāṁśābhivyaktau tu tatra brahmāṇḍa katayaḥ, BSV, 2.3.30.} Further, due to the obscuration of bliss aspect of Brahman in jīvas, they forget their divine nature and are deprived of the six divine attributes, sovereignty (aṁśvarya), valour (vīrya), fame (vaśas), beauty (śrī), knowledge (jñāna) and detachment (vairāgya).\footnote{54. īśvarecchayā jīvasya bhagavaddharma tirobhāvaḥ...... ānandāṁśastu pūrvaṁ eva tirohitaḥ. ibid., 3.2.5.} As a result, the jīvas are caused to travel in the cycle of birth and death in the phenomenal world and are subjected to the consequent pains and sufferings. In the view of Vallabha, the jīvas are divided into three classes, namely, pure (suddha), worldly (samsārin) and liberated (mukta). When the divine qualities like aṁśvarya etc are not obscured by ignorance, the jīva is called pure. When its divine qualities are obscured by ignorance, the jīva is called samsārin. It is mukta when it is freed from ignorance and realizes its real nature.

According to Vallabha the jīva and Brahman are non-different from each other. He further adds that among the three aspects of Brahman, namely, sat, cit and ānanda, only two aspects – sat and cit are manifested in the jīva, whereas the aspect of ānanda is obscured. Thus, the jīva is non-different from Brahman under certain limitations.

According to Vallabha, in the state of liberation, the jīva does not become identical with Brahman, but remains in perpetual association with
Him. This liberation is a form of sayujya in which the jīva in the form of a Gopi attains Śrīkṛṣṇa as its lover, and perpetually enjoys the sports of rāsa with him.\textsuperscript{55}

\textbf{JĪVA ACCORDING TO NIMBĀRKA:}

According to Nimbārka, the jīva or the individual self is a conscious dependent reality. In the view of Nimbārka, the jīva is of the nature of consciousness, at the same time it is also the substratum of consciousness, i.e. both jñānasvarūpa and jñānāsraya. Being the nature of consciousness, the jīva is self-luminous. It is pure, eternal etc. But in the empirical level, under the influence of avidyā, it does not realize its real nature. According to Nimbārka, avidyā means the past deeds of the jīva, but does not mean the false knowledge or illusion. Accordingly, the jīva influenced by avidyā is subjected to bondage from beginningless time.\textsuperscript{56} Under bondage the jīva identifies itself with the empirical ego, and is confined to the empirical world. The jīva is an active agent and it performs actions and gets the fruits thereof.

According to Nimbārka, the jīva is not independent, because it is an aṁśa of Brahman. In the view of Nimbārka, aṁśa does not mean part; it means potency or śakti. In other word, the jīva is regarded as śakti of Parabrahman. The jīva is atomic in magnitude. That is why the jīva can get out of a body at the time of death and enter into the womb of another for the next birth. Though the jīva is atomic, it enlightens and pervades the whole

\textsuperscript{55} sayujyāṁ parama-puruṣārthāḥ. BSV, 1.1.3.
\textsuperscript{56} anādikarmātmikāvidyā. Vedāntakaustubha, 1.3.20.
body by its quality of knowledge, just as a lamp occupying a small space in a room illuminates the whole room. Thus the jīva experiences the pleasures and pains of the entire organism. Nimbārka further says that the jīva cannot be all-pervasive, because an all-pervasive entity cannot move.

In the view of Nimbārka, the jīvas are many in number. The jīvas are also distinct from one another. Nimbārka opines that, in the state of liberation also the jīvas are distinct from one another, though all of them are inseparably related to Brahman.\(^57\)

The relation between the jīva and Brahman is regarded by Nimbārka as both identical with and different from Brahman. By the term ‘identity’ Nimbārka does not mean absolute one-ness, but non-cognition of difference. Nimbārka further argues that the jīva is the effect of Brahman, which is both material cause and efficient cause of it. Hence, Brahman and the jīva are non-different.

According to Nimbārka, in the state of liberation, though the jīva and Brahman are not completely identical, they are similar in nature and quality, since both of them are pure, stainless and omniscient. In this state, the jīva attains a luminous divine body and exists in eternal association with Lord. Nimbārka upholds that this relation of identity cum difference is natural and not conditional. In other words, this relation of identity cum difference is true for all time, it exists even in dissolution and release. That is why the system of Nimbārka is called svābhāvika bhedābhedavāda.\(^58\)

\(^57\) bandhamoksārthena svarūpena bhinnah. *Vedantakaustubha*, 2.3.42

\(^58\) jīvaparamātmanoḥ svābhāvikau bhedābhedau bhavataḥ. ibid., 2.3.42.
JīVA ACCORDING TO VĪRASAIVISM:

In the Vīraśaiva philosophy the term “paśu” is used to denote individual self or ātman. Many other terms are also used to mean individual self. In Nārada-Parivṛṣajakopanīṣad it is termed as jīva.⁵⁹ the Cintyāgama mentions the following terms to denote the individual self, namely, kṣetrajña, puruṣa, pancaviṃśaka etc. The Vīraśaiva Dharmasiromāṇi ⁶¹ mentions seven terms to denote the individual self – viz, anu, ātman, jīva, paśu, pudgala, kṣetrajña and puruṣa. Further, Vīraśaivism uses two terms – piṇḍa and aṅga to indicate the paśu which are very significant. According to Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi – the individual self which has pure internal organs owing to the meritorious deeds in the previous births and whose taints and sins have decreased, is termed as piṇḍa.⁶² It is noteworthy that the term piṇḍa is taken by Vīraśaiva mystics in a distinct sense to denote the advanced stage of the self. Again, the Vīraśaiva philosophers uphold that piṇḍa can be compared to the jñānī, who is bound to attain God at the end of a number of births, as stated in the Bhagavadgīta. In brief, it can be said

⁵⁹. ayyā tattvitattvagalilladandu..... jīva paramareḥ ba bhāva taledoradandu. VI, p.275.
⁶⁰. kṣetrajñāḥ puruṣaścaiva pañcaviṃśaka ityapi / paśurityādināmāṇi parāyena bhavanti hi //
   cf. H.P. Malledevaru, Essentials of Virasaivism, p. 33
⁶¹. anurātmā ca jīvaśca paśuḥ pudgala eva ca /
   kṣetrajñāḥ puruṣaścetī saptaite jīvavācinaḥ // VDS,
   Paricched –I, p.17.
⁶². bahujanmākṛtalḥ punyaiḥ prakšīne pāpāṇjare /
   suddhāntah-karaṇodehi piṇḍasabdena giyate//
   Malledevaru, op. cit., p. 5.
that the pure self whose taints and sins are diminished and who as a consequence, enjoys purity of internal organs and in whom devotion dawns owing to the grace of God, can be termed as *pînda*.\(^6\) The *pînda* has been classified into three, namely, *ādipînda*, *madhyapînda* and *anādipînda*. These three are also termed as *jīvapînda*, *sujñānapînda* and *citpînda* respectively. Depending upon the three-fold body, the *ādipînda* is again classified into three — *sthūlapînda*, *sūkṣmapînda* and *kāraṇapînda*.

According to Vīraśaivism, the individual self that tries with utmost devotion to realize the *liṅga* is called *aṅga*.\(^4\) The term *aṅga* is derived as follows to convey the philosophical significance — “*am*” stands for the ultimate reality i.e. Brahman; “*gam*” for the movement of the individual self which strives to attain *liṅga*. In other words it can be said that ceaseless effort of an aspirant to become one with God may be termed as *aṅga*. But it is noteworthy that according to Vīraśaivism all the *jīvas* cannot become *aṅga*. The *jīvas* which have overcome the taints by good action, which has attained purity of internal organs owing to the grace of God and whose limited energy is transformed into supreme devotion, is termed as *aṅga*. In *Vīraśaiva* philosophy the *aṅga* is also regarded as equivalent to the ‘*tvam*’ of the Upanisadic *mahāvākyā* ‘*tattvamasi*’. They interpret the Upanisadic *mahāvākyā* as follows — the term ‘*tat*’ stands for ‘*liṅga*’ or supreme self, ‘*tvam*’ for ‘*aṅga*’ and ‘*asi*’ for ‘*tādātmya*’ or oneness or identity. Thus, this

---

\(^6\) *śivabhaktissāṁ utpannā, prapañcēśmin vikalpate/
punyadikyatksināpāḥ suddhātmā pîṇḍanāmakāḥ //
AVS, Pt. I, Prakaraṇa IX. p.122.

\(^4\) *anādyantamaṁ liṅgam tatparaṁ paramam prati /
jadgacchati mahabhaktyā tadaṅgamiti niścitam // SAS, IV. 2. p.46.
mahāvākyā means ‘liṅgāṅgasāmyoga’ (the union of liṅga and aṅga) or ‘liṅgāṅgasāmarasya’ (merging or union of liṅga and aṅga), which is a well known term in Vīraśaivism indicating the summum bonum of life.65

According to Vīraśaiva philosophy the jīva is a part of Śiva and it is pure, eternal and free from all blemish. In other words in reality the jīva is Śiva Himself. The jīva is created by Śiva from His own conscious energy. This conscious energy is known as vimāraśāakti and it is always abiding in Śiva. The vimāraśāakti is endowed with three qualities, viz., existence (sat), consciousness (citt) and bliss (ānanda) like Śiva Himself. The energy of Lord Śiva is endowed with various powers and also with the three qualities (guṇas).

According to Siddhāntaśikhamāṇi, the undivided consciousness (akhaṇḍa caitanya) of Brahman occupies the supreme position owing to the influence of suddhasattva. This undivided consciousness of Brahman has become the individual self owing to the influence of rajaguṇa, being mixed with a little sattva and tamaś.66 Again the same undivided consciousness of Brahman owing to the influence of complete tamaś quality has become the object of enjoyment. Further Vīraśaivism asserts that there are two types of māyā—śuddhamāyā and aśuddhamāyā. One of the aspects of Śiva, being influenced by the aśuddhamāyā becomes the jīva.

Regarding the relation between the individual self and the universal self, both Vīraśaiva mystics and philosophers accept the idea that there is a difference between the individual self and the universal self in the

66. kincitsattvarajorūpaṁ bhoktṛṣaṁjñā kamucyate. SSi, Vol - I, V. 42.
beginning and non-difference at the stage of liberation. The mystics of *Virasaiva* realized the truth of the Upanisadic passages, which emphasize the duality (*dvaita*) and also the non-duality (*advaita*) of the individual self and the universal self. The mystics have accepted that the difference between the individual self and the universal self exists only in the initial stage. When the self, realises its nature and resorts to spiritual pursuits, then gradually the distinction decreases. In the last stage, the individual self becomes one with the *Liṅga* (Brahman). In other words, *Virasaivism* speaks of the absolute ultimate identity between the *jīva* and the Brahman at liberation. According to *Virasaivism*, though the *jīva* resides in body, it is different from body. The *jīva* impels the inactive body into action and enjoys the fruits of the action.

The *Virasaiva* philosophers state that the individual self is known as ‘*viśva*’ in the waking state; as ‘*taijasa*’ in the dreaming state and as ‘*prajñā*’ in the state of deep sleep.\(^67\) Further they state that an individual self is endowed with a three-fold body, viz, gross (*sthūla*), subtle (*sūkṣma*) and causal (*kāraṇa*). The individual self as *viśva*, *taijasa* and *prajñā* resides in the gross, subtle and causal bodies respectively. *Viśva*, *taijasa* and *prajñā* are also termed as *jīvātma*, *antarātma* and *paramātma*. But in the *Vacanaśāstras* nine *ātman* are mentioned, viz, *jīvātma*, *antarātma*, *paramātma*, *nirmalātma*, *ṣuddhātma*, *jñātatma*, *mahātma*, *divyātma* and *cinmayātma*. Actually, the description given in the *Vacanaśāstra* in respect of these nine types of *ātman* shows clearly the purity of the self in ascending order.

---

\(^67\). *viśvo jāgradavasthāyāṁ svapnākhyāṁ tu taijasaḥ /
prajñāḥ suṣuptyavasthāyāṁ liṅgatrayamupāsat // SAS, V.62.*
According to Vīraśaivism the individual self is an eternal entity, infinite and all-pervasive. In reality it is non-different from God, but the self is veiled by the three-fold taints. Actually, the undivided consciousness of Lord Śiva has become the individual self due to its own sport or avidyā.

In brief, it may be said that, according to Vīraśaivism, the individual self is different from the universal self only at the empirical level, but will become one with the absolute at liberation, exactly as water mixes with water.68

JĪVA IN ŚRĪPATI’S PHILOSOPHY:

According to Śrīpati, Brahman or Śiva is endowed with śakti or power, which is of two kinds – cit-śakti (conscious power) and acit-śakti (non-conscious power). Acit-śakti has two aspects – śuddha or pure and aśudha or impure. The impure aspect produces prakṛti and kañcukas or coverings of kāla, niyati, rāga, vidyā and kalā. In the view of Śrīpati, Śiva confined by the five kañcukas appears as the empirical self. Śrīpati uses the term paśu to indicate empirical self.

Śrīpati admits the individual self as atomic in size but not as ubiquitous. According to Śrīpati the atomic magnitude of the individual is natural. Being eternal and unborn, it does not depend for its existence upon the internal organ which comes into being after creation. In reality, the atomic magnitude of the self must not be regarded as caused by the internal organ, but as natural to the self.69 But, the most important point is

68. yathā ghṛte ghṛtaṁ nyastaṁ kṣīre kṣīraṁ jale jalam / kevalatvaṁ yathā prāptaṁ na kiñcidapi tadbhavet // Kānikāgama, quoted in AVS, Vol. – II, p.249.
69. tasmāt jīvasya anūtvam svabhāvikaṁ iti niściyate. BSSR (C.H.Rao), Vol. – II, 2.3.28
that, according to Śrīpati, the individual self is atomic in its bound stage and it is revealed as ubiquitous in its liberated state.\textsuperscript{70}

According to Śrīpati, the individual self or \textit{paśu} is both knowledge and knower, because it is accepted that knowledge is both the essence and essential attribute of the \textit{paśu}. In this regard, Śrīpati mentions the Vedic passages like, ‘the self is full of knowledge’, ‘an internal light’, ‘who can know the knower’ etc.\textsuperscript{71} Further, Śrīpati says that the \textit{paśu} is an active agent. It acquires merits by performing actions described in the Vedas and enjoys pleasures. On the other hand the \textit{paśu} acquires demerits by following the opposite actions and suffers pains and sorrows. Actually, the self, being unaware of its merits and demerits, cannot bring forth the relevant fruits, while God being omniscient and omnipotent, can do so.

According to Śrīpati, the self has three states – waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep. The self experiences the external objects with sense-organs, the motor-organs and the mind in the waking state. In the dreaming state, the self experiences dream objects with its subtle body and it experiences a trace of bliss with its causal body of nescience in the dreamless sleep. But, a released self goes beyond these three states and attains union with God or Śiva.

According to Śrīpati, Śiva is the cause of bondage and liberation of \textit{paśu}. In reality, Śiva is the cause of all the attainments of the individual self or \textit{paśu}, including its bondage and liberation. Śiva veils the knowledge

\textsuperscript{70} muktasya tu parameśvararat- jīvānuttādi vidhāyaka śāstram baddha jīva viṣayakaṁ. BSSR(C.H.Rao), Vol.- II, 4.4.51.

\textsuperscript{71} yo' yam ātmā vijñānamayah antar – jyotih; esa hi draṣṭā śrotā ghratā rasayitā mantā boddhā kartā vijñānātmā puruṣa.

ibid., Vol.- II, 2.3.17.
of the self by His power of māyā in the form of bonds. Again, He helps the self to destroy the power of māyā by acquiring the real knowledge of itself or Brahman, and thus attain liberation. Actually, without the help of Brahman or grace of Brahman none can destroy māyā or attain liberation.72

The self in its real nature is called aṅga-sthala, because it takes resort to Śiva i.e. Liṅga-Sthala. Aṅga-Sthala has three states – namely, yogāṅga, bhogāṅga and tyāgāṅga. Yogāṅga leads the self to absolute bliss, bhogāṅga leads to the enjoyment with Śiva and tyāgāṅga leads to the abandonment of the world of illusion. Yogāṅga, bhogāṅga and tyāgāṅga correspond to the prajñā-stage, taijasa-stage and viśva-stage of the individual self respectively. Further each of these three states are divided into two. Thus yogāṅga is divided into aikya and śarāṇa, bhogāṅga into prāṇa and prasādin and tyāgāṅga into maheśvara and bhakta.73

According to Śrīpati, Brahman is the source of the self and the self is nothing but Brahman or Śiva under the limitation of avidyā and the five kañcukas. The Supreme Reality or Śiva influenced by avidyā, becomes individual selves. When these avidyās are removed by karman or the performance of duties prescribed in the Śruti and also by real knowledge of the Supreme Reality, the self is freed from all sorts of worldly bindings. Ultimately the self realizes its identity with Śiva. Śrīpati holds that the self

73. sadāhur aṅgāṇi maheśvarsya. ibid., Vol. – II, 1.1.2.
is a part of Brahman just as a ray of light is a part of luminous body.\textsuperscript{74} The self is both different from and identical with Śiva, just as a ray of light is both different from and identical with the luminous body. In this regard Śrīpati argues that Śruti also admits both identity and difference between Brahman and the self. The simile of two beautiful birds thus expresses difference between the self and Brahman, where the self is regarded as the experiencer of the fruits of its actions and Brahman as the mere onlooker. It is however, held that these two positions of difference and non-difference between the self and Brahman refer to two different states: difference refers to the state of the self’s bondage, non-difference to the state of liberation. These two positions are regarded as natural by Śrīpati. Further, Śrīpati argues that there is difference between Brahman and the self in the waking state and non-difference in the deep-sleep. So, there is difference in creation and non-difference in dissolution.\textsuperscript{75} In the highest state of the self or in the state of liberation, the self becomes omnipotent, omniscient and ubiquitous and is endowed with infinite knowledge and bliss. In other words it can be said that the difference between Brahman and the self is real only in the empirical level. As the self makes progress in its spiritual journey towards Brahman the idea of difference gradually vanishes. In the final stage of this journey, the complete identity between the self and Šiva is realized.

\textsuperscript{74} jīvāḥ brahmaṇāḥ aṁśaṁ eva. BSSR(C.H.Rao), Vol. – II, 2.3.40.

\textsuperscript{75} srṣṭikāle bhavedbhedamabhedaṁ pralaye śmrtaṁ.
ibid., Vol. – II, 2.1.22.
COMPARISON OF ŚRĪPATI'S CONCEPT OF JĪVA WITH OTHER SCHOOLS OF ŚAIVISM

ŚRĪPATI'S CONCEPT OF JĪVA WITH THAT OF PĀŚUPATA ŚAIVISM:

The nature of the self in the view of Śrīpati and in Pāśupata Śaivism is different. According to Śrīpati, the Supreme Reality or Śiva confined by the five kañcukas appears as the empirical self. On the other hand Pāśupata Śaivism advocates that the bound self or paśu is an effect of Śiva because they are bound by God. Pāśupata further says that the self under bondage is regarded as an effect, since it is bound, produced, favoured, veiled by nescience and subjected to time by the will of Śiva. Regarding the size of the self Śrīpati advocates that the self is atomic in size and it is not ubiquitous. But Pāśupata system says that the self is neither atomic nor intermediary in magnitude, but is all-pervasive. In this context, Śrīpati mentions the Vedic passages like ‘the self is atomic’ etc. On the other hand, Vedic statements which declare the self as vibhū or ubiquitous, it is not individual self but universal self. It is noteworthy that according to Śrīpati, though the self is regarded as atomic, it is atomic only in its bound state, it is revealed as ubiquitous in its liberated state. But, Pāśupata system advocates that the self is all-pervasive in all the states. The world of fourteen levels is the field of birth, death and activity of the self.

According to Śrīpati, the self is both knowledge and knower of the objects. On the other hand Pāśupata system says that the self is a knower of objects, an experiencer of pleasure and pain and witness. Further, Śrīpati admits that the self is an active agent. It acquires merits by performing actions prescribed by śāstras. It acquires demerits by following the opposite
course of actions. On the other hand Pasupata advocates that the self is endowed with consciousness, which is its essential quality. The consciousness of the self is infinite, but it becomes limited when it is veiled by ignorance. The ignorance can be removed by spiritual practices prescribed by śāstra. When this ignorance is removed, the consciousness of the self reveals itself again in its infinite nature. According to Pasupata system, in the empirical state the individual self is termed as paśu. The paśu is associated with pāsa, i.e. the sense-organs, the motor-organs, the physical body etc. This bound self being dependent and subject to birth and death, is regarded as non-eternal. In its real or transcendental nature manifested in liberation, the self is absolutely free from all the pāsas and the empirical qualities.

According to Śripati, the individual selves are of three kinds, namely, paśu (bound), śuddha (pure) and mukta (released). The paśu identifies him with mind-body and is enchanted by the objects of the world of illusion. The śuddha selves are those which are endowed with the qualities of self-control, detachment desire for release and devotion to Śiva. The released selves have realized Śiva and have merged themselves in the being of Śiva. On the other hand, in the view of Pāṣupata Śaivism the selves are of two kinds, namely, impure or tainted and pure or taintless. According to Pāṣupata Śaivism the selves are many and are different in different individuals. The existence of the self can be inferred from the facts of pleasure, pain, aversion, desire, volition and consciousness.
Regarding the relation between Brahman or Śiva and the self, both Śrīpati and Pāśupata Śaivism mention different views. According to Śrīpati, the self is a part of Brahman and is both different from and identical with it. On the other hand, according to Pāśupata Śaivism, Śiva is the only and supreme cause of the universe, all other entities being his effects, including self. As an effect the self is different from Śiva and not intermixed with him, because, the self is mutable while Śiva is immutable. Both Śrīpati and Pāśupata system hold that Śiva or Brahman is the ultimate cause of the bondage and liberation of the self. But, both accept the different views regarding the nature of the state of the liberated self. According to Śrīpati, in the state of liberation, the worshipper and the worshipped become identical, both being revealed as Śiva. The self, in the state of liberation, becomes omnipotent, omniscient and ubiquitous and is endowed with infinite knowledge and bliss. Thus, Śrīpati maintain identity and difference under two different state of the self’s existence. On the other hand, according to Pāśupata Śaivism, in the state of liberation, the self does not merge in or become one with Śiva, but remains in perpetual association with Śiva. Further, the liberated self acquires the excellent qualities of Śiva like omniscience, omnipotence lordship and others. But, at the same time, this system gives the idea that the liberated self is however not quite similar to Śiva, because the qualities like omniscience, omnipotence etc pertaining to the self is ‘acquired’ while these qualities are ‘natural’ to Śiva. So, the liberated self cannot perform cosmic activities, like creation, sustenance, etc, while Śiva can do it.

76. vyāpakaṁ maheśvara tattvaṁ vyāpyaṁ puruṣādi pañcaviṁśakaṁ. 
PAB. 2.5.
SRIPATI’S CONCEPT OF JIVA WITH THAT OF SAIVA-SIDDHANTA:

Both Śripati and Saiva-Siddhānta use the term ‘paśu’ for individual self or jīva. Both the systems admit that paśu is finite and dependent to ‘pati’. Further they hold that pati or Śiva is endowed with śakti or power. The śakti of Śiva is of two kinds – cit-śakti or conscious power and acit-śakti or non-conscious power. Acit-śakti known as māyā has two aspects – śuddha or pure and aśuddha or impure. From the impure aspect of Śiva, the five kañcukas or coverings of kalā, niyati, rāga, vidyā and kāla are produced and then the impure principles evolved. Śiva confined by the five kañcukas appears as the puruṣa or the empirical self or bound self, the experiencer of pleasure, pain etc.77

According to Śripati, the self is both knowledge and knower. It is neither unconscious nor it is mere knowledge. Knowledge, being the essential attribute of the self, pertains to it even in the state of liberation. Saiva-Siddhānta also maintains that the self is of the nature of consciousness, knowledge and action. The self shares the nature of Śiva and is therefore omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient and eternal. But, because of its relation with the five kañcukas, it becomes limited or atomic. As a result of which, the self is endowed with limited knowledge, power and is subjected to birth and death. Both Śripati and Saiva-Siddhānta admit that Śiva is the cause of self’s bondage and liberation. Without the grace of Śiva none can attain liberation. According to Śripati, Śiva veils the

77. puniso’jña kartṛtārthāṁ māyātās tattvapañcakaṁ bhavati. kālo niyatīśca tathā kalā ca vidyā ca. TP, 23
knowledge of the self by His power of māyā in the forms of bonds. Again, Śiva helps the self destroying the power of māyā by the acquisition of the real knowledge of itself and Brahma and thereby attains liberation.

According to Śaiva-Siddhānta Śiva binds the selves to embodied life with the bonds. According to Mṛgendratantra, there are four kinds of bonds (pāśa), namely, malaja (born out of nescience), karmaja (born out of merits and demerits), māyiya (born out of subtle and gross bodies) and tirodhyāyaka (Śiva’s power of veiling). Among these four bonds mala is the principal bond. Mala is innate and beginningless. It veils the knowledge of the self.78

Though Śrīpati and Śaiva-Siddhānta express that Śiva is the cause of both the bondage and the liberation of the self, their views are different in the means of liberation of the self. According to Śrīpati, Śiva helps the self in destroying the power of māyā by the acquisition of the real knowledge of itself and Brahma or Śiva, and thereby attains liberation. According to Śaiva-Siddhānta the practice of eight-fold yoga is the means for attaining liberation.

According to Śrīpati, the individual selves are of three kinds, namely, paśu or bound, śuddha or pure and mukta or released. The bound selves are endowed with the objects of the world of illusion and identify themselves with mind-body. The pure selves are those which are endowed with the qualities of self-control, detachment, desire for release and devotion to Śiva. The released selves have realized Śiva or Brahma and have merged themselves in the being of Śiva. The Śaiva-Siddhānta also accepts three classes of individual selves—vijñāna-kala or those tainted only with mala,

78. pāsaścaturvidhāḥ syuḥ purīsa mala karmajau matau prathamau māyiya tirodhyāyaka śivaśakti samudbhavau cānyau. TP, 17.
pralaya-kala or those tainted with mala and karma, and sakala or those tainted with mala, karma and māyā. Therefore, it can be said that, both the systems admit that the self is many and they are different in different organism.

Regarding the relation between Śiva and the self, both the systems accept the same view. Both the systems opine that Śiva and the self are both different and non-different from each other. In the state of bondage the self is different from Śiva while in the state of liberation the self is non-different from Śiva. According to Śrīpati, Śiva is the source of the self and the self is nothing but Śiva limited by upādhis or avidyā and the five kañcukas. When these avidyās are removed by the performance of actions prescribed in the śāstras and also by real knowledge of the supreme reality, the self is freed from all sorts of worldly bindings and realizes its identity with Śiva. According to Śaiva-Siddhānta, the self in its essence is of the nature of Śiva. Like Śiva, the self is also omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent and eternal. But because of its relation with the taints, the self becomes atomic. As a result of which, the self is endowed with limited knowledge and power and is subjected to birth and death. In the state of liberation the self regains the nature of Śiva by His grace. But, the Śaiva-Siddhānta agrees in this point that though in the state of bondage the self is different from Śiva, it is not wholly different from Śiva, because it is Śiva who becomes the self under the influence of the beginningless taints or

79. pāśavas trividhā jñeya vijñānapralaya kevalau sakalaḥ. mayāuktaś tatrādyo malakarmayuto dvitiyāḥ syāt mala-māyā-karmayutaḥ sakalaḥ. 

TP, 8 - 9.
bonds. On the other hand Śrīpati opines that the self is different in the state of bondage. In the state of liberation the self becomes omnipresent, omnipotent, omniscient and is endowed with infinite knowledge and bliss. In other words, according to Śrīpati, the difference between Śiva and the self is real only in the empirical level. As the self makes progress in its spiritual journey, the complete identity between the self and Śiva is realized. On the other hand the Śaiva-Siddhānta opines that in the state of liberation, the self becomes one with Śiva, yet the former remains in the eternal service to the latter. It does not mean that the self is totally identical with Śiva. Actually, the self in this state does not look upon itself as other than Śiva. The Śaiva-Siddhānta uses the term ‘advaita’ to denote the relation between the self and Śiva. Here the term ‘advaita’ means not ‘one-ness’, but nonduality or ‘ananyatva’. In reality, it is not negation of two, but a case of negation of duality entailed by two. In other words, it can be said that according to Śaiva-Siddhāntin, the relation between Śiva and the self is neither external nor internal, neither bheda nor abheda.

ŚRĪPATI'S CONCEPT OF JĪVA WITH THAT OF ŚRĪKAṆṬHA'S PHILOSOPHY:

Both Śrīpati and Śrīkaṇṭha take the Brahma-Sūtra as their basic text to establish their philosophical theory. But their philosophical views are something different from each other. According to Śrīpati, Śiva confined by the five coverings (kalā, niyati, rāga, vidyā and kāla) appears as the empirical self or jīva. According to Śrīkaṇṭha, the selves are the attributes

80. pāsatē śivatē śruteḥ. MA, 17.
(viśeṣaṇas) and that Brahman, in its essence is the viśeṣya. He plainly mentions in his Brahma-Mimāṃsā-Bhāṣya that the individual selves or jīvas are not created or born. Śiva and jīva are of the same status. But the original powers of jīva are limited by malas or pāsas.

Both Śrīpati and Śrīkaṇṭha state that the jīva is atomic in magnitude. It is not all-pervasive. In this regards Śrīpati argues that if the self were all-pervasive, it would be present in all bodies and consequently would share experiences with all other selves. In that position actions and merits and demerits of the jīva would have no causal relation with its experiences. The atomic magnitude of the self is natural. On the other hand Śrīkaṇṭha says that, ‘the self is atomic’ can be inferred from its movements from one world to another. If the self were all-pervasive, it could not move in this way and it would always come in contact with all the objects. The atomic self resides in the heart of the individual self, wherefrom it spreads its quality of knowledge throughout the body, just as a drop of sandal-wood-paste applied to a part of the body cools the whole body.81

Śrīpati and Śrīkaṇṭha both admit that the self is of the nature of consciousness. It is both the essence and the essential quality of the self. The self is therefore, the knowledge and knower. Knowledge forming the essence of the self is inseparable from the self. In this regard Śrīpati mentions the Vedic passages which declare the self as full of knowledge or an internal light etc. Further, both the philosophers hold that the self is an active agent; it is not inactive. Being a free agent, the self experiences the

81. yathā candana binduḥ ekadeśasthaḥ api sakala deha vyāpi sukhaṁ janayati. BSSK, 2.3.24.
fruits of its own actions. In this regard Śrīpati argues that if the self were not an active agent, it would not be morally responsible for the acts done by itself. Accordingly, the injunctions and prohibitions prescribed in the Vedas would be meaningless. Both the philosophers agree in this point that the activity of the self is controlled by the will of Brahman. The self, being unaware of its merits and demerits, cannot bring forth the relevant fruits, while Śiva or Brahman being omniscient and omnipotent, can do so. The self is thus dependent on Śiva for the performance of its actions and also for getting fruits thereof.

Regarding the relation between Śiva and the jīva, both Śrīpati and Śrīkanṭha express different views. According to Śrīpati, the self is a part of Brahman, and is both different from and identical with it. On the other hand, Śrīkanṭha holds that the self is non-different from Śiva, though not completely identical with Him. Regarding the relation between Śiva and the jīva, Śrīpati opines that the self is both different from and identical with Śiva, just as a ray of light is both different from and identical with the luminous body. He also mentions the Vedic passages which declare both identity and difference between Brahman and the self.\(^\text{82}\) In this context Śrīpati argues that these two positions could be reconciled by taking the self to be a part of Brahman or Śiva. Further, it is held by Śrīpati that these two positions of difference and non-difference between the self and Brahman refer to two different states: difference refers to the state of the self's bondage; non-difference, to the state of liberation. On the other hand,

---

82. bhedābhedamātāṁ eva sūtrakāra mataṁ ......śruti śṛti purāṇāgama sūtrādiṣu bhedābheda pradarṣanāt. BSSK, 2.2.22
Śrīkaṇṭha expresses different views regarding two positions. He holds that between the self and Śiva, there is only internal difference (svagataḥbheda), because the self is a part of Śiva. Being a part of Śiva, the self is pervaded by Him; just as a piece of wood is pervaded by fire. Therefore, the self is non-different from Śiva, though not completely identical with Him. The scriptural passage, which declares ‘the self is Brahman’ does not mean identity between the self and Brahman, it simply denotes non-difference between them. Again, in the scriptural text, it is mentioned that through spiritual and yogic practices, the self can acquire some of the qualities of Śiva, but it can never be identical with Him. Even in the state of liberation, the self maintains its individuality. It is a relation of the pervaded-pervader.83 Further, Śrīkaṇṭha argues that just as the attributes form a part of the substance qualified by them, and are yet different from it so the selves, being related as attributes, are the parts of Brahman qualified by them and yet are different from it. Again the self is described as the body or effect of Brahman which is the cause. Therefore, it can be said that, in the view of Śrīkantha, the self is described from different standpoints, as the body, the attributes, the effect and the part of Brahman.

Both Śrīpati and Śrīkaṇṭha are agreeing in this point of view that Śiva is the cause of both bondage and liberation of the self. Śiva binds the selves by concealing their real nature and attributed in accordance with the beginningless flow of impurities in the form of merits and demerits. The essential nature of the self as supreme light or pure consciousness is

83. jīvātmā paramesvarasya aṁśa .... jīva brahmanoḥ vyāpya-vyāpakabhāvena ananyatvāṁ. BSSK, 2.3.42.
concealed during the state of bondage. Again, Śiva helps the selves by revealing their essential nature and attributes. By the grace of Śiva, after the exhaustion of the merits and demerits, the self acquires supreme knowledge, delight and power. Like Brahman, the self is endowed with unlimited knowledge, bliss and power. Thus, in the state of liberation, the self becomes similar to Brahman in nature, but is not identical with it. Śrīkaṇṭha says that the released self becomes equal to Brahman in respect of enjoyment alone, and not in respect of cosmic acts of creation, maintenance and destruction. On the other hand, it is well-mentioned that, according to Śrīpati, when the self makes progress in its spiritual journey towards Brahman or Śiva, the idea of difference between Śiva and jīva, gradually vanishes. In the final stage of this journey, the complete identity between the self and Śiva is realized.

ŚRĪPATI'S CONCEPT OF JĪVA WITH THAT OF PRATYABHIJṆĀ-ŚAIVISM:

Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism uses the term paśu for individual self, as the self is bound by pāsas (bonds) or malas. The Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism, is one of the most important systems of Kāśmīra Śaivism, a monistic school. Here we restrict ourselves to the first monistic school of Vasugupta, the author of ‘Śivasūtra’.

The views about the nature of the self described in the Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism are almost the same with the views of Śrīpati. According to Śrīpati, the power of Śiva is of two kinds — conscious power and non-conscious power. Non-conscious power is otherwise known as māyā. It has two

84. muktah ātmā brahmaśadṛśa guṇa svarūpaḥ. BSSK, 4.4.3.
aspects – pure and impure. From the impure aspects of māyā, first the five kañcukas or coverings of kalā, niyati, rāga, vidyā and kāla are produced, and then the well-known Sāmkhyān principles from prakṛti onwards are evolved. Śiva confined by the five kañcukas appears as the puruṣa or the empirical self. According to Pratyabhiṣjñā-Śaivism, during the process of evolution of different principles from Śiva, a principle called māyātattva comes out after the manifestation of the five pure principles of Śiva-tattva, Śakti-tattva, Sadāśiva-tattva, Iśvara-tattva and Śuddhavidyā-tattva. Actually, māyā-tattva is also called non-conscious power of Śiva, which conceals the real nature of Śiva and creates the idea of difference. From this māyātattva come forth the five kañcukas which are same as described by Śrīpati. According to Pratyabhiṣjñā-Śaivism, Śiva confined by māyātattva and the five kañcukas is the individual self. When Śiva assumes the power of māyā, His powers of omniscience and omnipotence are concealed, and His nature is sullied by the taints called āṇava-mala and karma-mala. This limited and tainted state of Śiva is called the individual self. In this state the self wrongly identifies itself with the insentient elements like the vital forces, the internal organs like the buddhi, manas ahamkāras etc. – the sense-organs and the body.

Both Śrīpati and Pratyabhiṣjñā-Śaivism state that the self is atomic in magnitude and is different in different organisms. It is not all-pervasive. Further, they admit that knowledge is both the essence and the essential attribute of the self. The self is therefore, both knowledge and the knower. According to Śrīpati, an individual self has three states – waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep. In the waking state the self experiences the external
objects with the sense-organs, the motor-organs and the mind. In the dreaming state it experiences dream objects with its subtle body and in the state of dreamless sleep, it experiences a trace of bliss with its causal body of nescience. On the other hand, in the Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism the self has five states – waking, dream, deep-sleep, ecstasy and superecstasy. Kṣemarāja, the author of Pratyabhijñāhrdaya, describes the waking state as the perception of external objects through the sense-organs. In the dreaming state the self experiences the objects produced by the manas only. He describes deep sleep as non-discrimination, non-apprehension and full of mayā; ecstasy state as a flash of supreme delight due to the experience of the manifestation of the ātman even when empirical objects are perceived as different from one another and the super-ecstasy state as the result of the perfection of the practice of ecstasy, in which a yogin becomes like Śiva of the nature of transcendent, free, pure consciousness and bliss, because his body is not yet destroyed. He becomes Śiva himself, when his body perishes. According to Kṣemarāja, when a yogin’s desire for empirical objects is destroyed, he acquires the state of ecstasy and valid knowledge of ātman and ceases to be an empirical knower identified with his subtle body.

In case of classification of jīva, Śrīpati and the followers of Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism express different views. According to Śrīpati, the individual selves are of three kinds, namely, paśu (bound), suddha (pure) and mukta (released). The bound selves identify themselves with the mind-body. They have false conceit of “I”, and are devoid of self-control, desire for release and devotion to Śiva. The released selves have realized Śiva and have merged themselves in the being of Śiva. On the other hand,
Somānanda, the author of Śivadrṣṭi describes five kinds of jīva – 1) Paśu or bound self, which does not know their original nature as Śiva. They are also called knowers limited by their subtle bodies and they are influenced by māyāśakti. 2) Some individual selves know themselves as the nature of Śiva under the influence of the power of vidyā. The fact that they are always of the nature of Śiva, whether they know this fact or not. So they are always calm. 3) Some individual selves acquire the firm conceit that they are identical with Śiva, owing to a certain degree of power of māyā. 4) Some individual selves are devoid of any knowledge of objects as different from them, which is due to mala called māyiya-mala. They are called pralayakevalins. 5) Some individual selves know their nature as Absolute. They do not identify their selves with their subtle bodies and do not know the objects as different from themselves. They are known as vijñānakevalins. These are the five different individual selves as different from Śrīpati’s doctrine.

Both Śrīpati and the followers of Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism advocate that Śiva is the cause of bondage and liberation of the self. Śiva conceals the knowledge of the self by his power of māyā, in the form of bonds. Again, he helps the self in destroying this power of māyā by the acquisition of the real knowledge of itself and Brahman, and thereby attains liberation. In the state of liberation the self realizes its real nature, it becomes identical with Śiva. Further, Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism adds this point that during the state of liberation there is no plurality of the selves, since at that time, the finite selves become one with Śiva. In other words, it can be said that in
transcendental level, the individual selves have no existence; there is only one reality which is *advaita* or non-dual Śiva.\(^8^5\)

Regarding the relation between Śiva and *jīva*, the views of Śrīpati and Pratyabhijñā-Śaivism are different. Śrīpati holds that the *jīva* is a part of Śiva and is both different from and identical with Śiva. In the state of bondage, the self is different from Śiva and in the state of liberation it is identical with Śiva. Further, Śrīpati mentions that Śiva influenced by āvidyā becomes the individual selves. When this āvidyā is destroyed by the acquisition of real knowledge of itself and Brahman, and thereby attain liberation. But, Pratyabhijñā system advocates a different view. According to this system bondage and liberation of the self are nothing but empirical experiences, and has no ontological reality. In its real nature, the self is always identical with Śiva; and therefore, it is eternally free. In reality, the self seems to be bound only because of the limitations assumed by Śiva by his free will. Therefore, bondage of the self is false; it is neither intrinsic nor extrinsic to the nature of the self. Bondage being false, liberation is also without any reality. Thus, bondage and liberation are unreal from the transcendental point of view.\(^8^6\) In other words, it can be said that this system advocates the existence of only one Ultimate Reality or Śiva. Basically there is no difference between Śiva and the *jīva*. The individual selves are within Śiva for all time.

\(^{85}\) sarva deheśvapi sa eva eko....... pratiprāṇe prthakatvena aham iti pratayo māyiyo na tattvikah. Vivṛti on SPK, 1.3

\(^{86}\) bandha moksau na bhidyate sarvatraiva sevatvataḥ. SD, 3.68.
COMPARISON OF ŚRĪPATI’S CONCEPT OF JĪVA WITH THAT OF ADVAITA-VEDĀNȚA:

Śrīpati and Śaṅkara both wrote their commentaries on Bhrahmasūtra of Bādarāyaṇa. But their philosophical views are different from each other. Regarding the concept of jīva also both the philosophers advocate different views. According to Śrīpati, Śiva confined by the five kañcukas (coverings) appears as the puruṣa or the empirical self. The five kañcukas are the product of impure aspect of māyā, which is the power of Śiva. On the other hand, Advaita Vedāntin holds that due to māyā the cosmic nescience, Brahman appears as the empirical selves. So, it is clear that the concept of māyā is different in the Śrīpati’s system. In Śrīpati’s philosophy, māyā is non-conscious power of Śiva. On the other hand, according to Advaitin, māyā is nothing but cosmic nescience.

According to Śrīpati, the jīva is both knowledge and knower. Knowledge, being the essential attribute of the jīva, pertains to it even in the state of liberation. But Advaita holds that the jīva is mere knowledge. Both Śrīpati and Advaitin accept the same view in this regard that the jīva is an active agent. It acquires merits and demerits according to its good and bad deeds, and experiences their fruits. Accordingly, it is subject to transmigration and bondage. Such a bound self attains liberation through the acquisition of real knowledge.

Both Śrīpati and Advaitin admit that the self has three states: waking, dreaming and dreamless sleep. In the waking state the self experiences the external objects with sense-organs, motor-organs and the mind and in this state it is endowed with gross and subtle body. In the dreaming state, the senses are at rest and only the mind is active. The self experiences the
dreaming object with its subtle body. In the state of dreamless sleep, it experiences a trace of bliss with its causal body. The Advaita Vedāntin call the jīva in waking stage as viśva, in the dreaming stage as taijasa and in the stage of dreamless sleep as prajñā. Further, Advaitin advocates that ajñāna is the causal body of the self. The five sense-organs, five motor-organs, five vital airs, manas and buddhi form the subtle body and the five material elements form the gross body.

Śrīpati regards the individual self as atomic in size, and not as all-pervasive. But, according to Advaita-Vedānta, as regards the question, whether the jīva is one or many, there are differences of opinion among the Advaitins. According to some followers of the Advaitavāda the jīva is many, because the adjunct of the jīva, namely, the internal organ or the individual nescience is different in different individuals. According to some followers, the jīva is one, not many. Other jīva as well as their bondage and liberation are all illusory. This theory is known as ‘theory of single jīva’ (ekajīvavāda). Another group of ekajīvavādin hold that, Hiranyagarbha is the only principal jīva, while other jīvas are his mere reflections. This theory is called the ‘theory of single jīva with many distinct bodies’ (saviṣeṣaṇeṣakaśarīraikajīvavāda). Again another group of ekajīvavādin hold that the ‘single jīva’ is one who animates all the bodies without any distinction. This view is known as ‘theory of single jīva with many distinctionless bodies’ (aviṣeṣaṇeṣakaśarīraikajīvavāda).

87. ekasya eva jīvatvāt itaresāṁ taddṛṣṭi viṣṇmbhitatvena tataḥ anatirekāt.
cf. The Self in Indian Philosophy, p. 78.
The later Advaitins accept an intermediate stage called *sākṣin* or witness self in between the *jīva* and *ātman*. This *sākṣin* is different from both the *jīva* and *ātman*. But, Śrīpati does not mention about the witness self.

Regarding the relation between the Brahman or Śiva and *jīva*, Śrīpati accepts different relations between Śiva and the *jīva* corresponding to the different states of the latter. In other words, Śrīpati accepts that the *jīva* is both different from and identical with Śiva; just as a ray of light is both different from and identical with the luminous body. In this context Śrīpati mentions the Vedic passages which declares the *jīva* as different from Brahman.\(^8\) But there are some Vedic passages which speaks of identity between the *jīva* and Brahman.\(^9\) In this context Śrīpati is of the view that the self must be regarded as a part of Brahman. On the other hand, according to Advaitins, the *jīva* and Brahman are one or the *jīva* is identical with Brahman, and it is the fundamental concept of the Advaita-Vedānta. The reality underlying the universe is identical with the reality underlying *jīva*. The Advaitins maintain that the *jīva* is the essence of *saccidānandarūpa* alike Brahman; the *jīva* is also eternal, pure, conscious and ever-free. But, in the empirical level this real nature is not revealed. In the empirical level the *jīva* conditioned by the adjuncts of body, mind etc individualises itself and maintains the idea of its difference from Brahman. Such a *jīva* looks upon itself as finite, limited and subject to joys and sorrows. Advaitins maintain that *avidyā* or ignorance is responsible for this false representation of *jīva*. When this *avidyā* is destroyed by the real knowledge of Brahman, 

\(^8\) jivabrahmaṇaḥ paraspara svabhāva-bheda vailakṣaṇyaṁ darśitaṁ. BSSR(C.H.Rao), Vol.-II, 2.1.23.
\(^9\) niranjaftah paramaṁ samyam upati. ibid., Vol.-II, 2.1.22.
the *jīva* becomes identical with Brahman. Some followers of Advaita-Vedānta explain this position in another way also. They admit that the *jīva* is a reflection of Brahman in *antaḥkaraṇa* or in *avidyā*. As there is no difference between *bimba* and the *pratibimba* (reflection), the *jīva* is not different from the prototype,90 just as the face reflected in the mirror is not different from the prototype. But, Śrīpati argues that the *jīva* cannot be regarded as a reflection of Brahman in the internal organ of a being, for the original and its reflection cannot co-exist in the same locus, while Brahman is declared by the Vedas as residing in the heart of a being. Further, if the individual self be a reflection, it must be false.

So, from the above discussion, it can be said that there is difference of opinion between Śrīpati’s philosophy and in the philosophy of Śaṅkara’s Advaita-Vedānta regarding the relation between Brahman and the *jīva*. According to Śrīpati, the difference between the *jīva* and Śiva is caused by limiting conditions, during the state of *jīva*’s bondage. In the highest state of reality or in the state of liberation, the worshipper and the worshipped become identical, both being revealed as Śiva. The *jīva* becomes omnipotent, omniscient and all-pervasive and is endowed with unlimited bliss and knowledge. But according to Advaita-Vedānta the difference between the *jīva* and Brahman is an illusion. In reality this view or this idea, i.e. there is distinction between the *jīva* and Śiva in the beginning, but identity at the end, distinguishes the philosophy of Śrīpati from Advaita-Vedānta of Śaṅkara, which advocates complete identity between the self and Brahman under all conditions.

* * *

90. brahmaiva avidyā pratibimbatvaṁ iti vadāmaḥ.  
Panca-Pādikā-Vivaraṇah, P-760